DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 342 HE 033 099

AUTHOR	O'Meara, KerryAnn
TITLE	Rewarding Faculty Professional Service. Working Paper.
INSTITUTION	Massachusetts Univ., Boston. New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
REPORT NO	NERCHE-WP-19
PUB DATE	1997-03-00
NOTE	37p.; For other Working Papers, see HE 033 100-101.
AVAILABLE FROM	New England Resource Center for Higher Education, University of Massachusetts at Boston, Graduate College of Education, W/2/143-06, Boston, MA 02125-3393; Tel: 617-287-7740; Fax: 617-287-7747; e-mail: nerche@umbsky.cc.umb.edu.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Awards; *College Faculty; Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Handbooks; Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; Merit Pay; Professional Recognition; Recognition (Achievement); *Rewards; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Evaluation; Tenure
IDENTIFIERS	American Association for Higher Education; *Faculty Service

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the process of rewarding college faculty for professional service, and is based on data from an American Association for Higher Education forum on faculty roles and rewards, as well numerous college and university promotion and tenure documents and faculty handbooks. These data were examined in relationship to current research and literature on faculty professional service. Results uncovered best practices in only 26 institutions (which are referenced in the paper). Sections of the paper present a history of faculty professional service in higher education; discuss rewarding faculty professional service through the promotion and tenure system; define faculty professional service; review ways to document faculty professional service; list primary and secondary criteria for assessing the quality and scholarship of faculty professional services; define two groups who can be appropriately used to evaluate faculty professional service (clients/community leaders/peers and faculty/committee members); and discuss alternative ways of rewarding faculty professional service. An annotated list of 27 faculty promotion and tenure documents is appended. (Contains 16 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 443 342

New England Resource Center *for* Higher Education

University of Massachusetts *at* Boston

Working Paper #19

Rewarding Faculty Professional Service

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. FULLER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

HE 033 099

© Published by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education. All rights reserved. Do not copy without permission.

New England Resource Center *for* Higher Education

Working Paper # 19

Rewarding Faculty Professional Service

KerryAnn O'Meara

March 1997

University of Massachusetts Boston
Graduate College of Education
W/2/143-06
Boston, Massachusetts 02125-3393
Phone: (617) 287-7740
Fax: (617) 287-7747
email: nerche@umbsky.cc.umb.edu

Abstract

Scholars of higher education have long recognized that existing reward systems and structures in academic communities do not weight faculty professional service as they do teaching and research. In the past five years, however, many colleges and universities have found innovative ways to define, document, and evaluate faculty professional service in traditional promotion and tenure systems. Other institutions have created or expanded alternate faculty reward systems, including faculty profiles in service, merit pay, and post-tenure reviews emphasizing service. Based on data from a nation-wide sample, this paper discusses innovations in rewarding faculty professional service and offers conclusions and recommendations.

Introduction

Scholars who study higher education have long recognized that existing reward systems and structures in academic communities do not reward faculty professional service as they do teaching and research (Crosson, 1983). However, in the past five years many colleges and universities have taken steps to change this reality by finding new and innovative ways to define, document, and evaluate faculty professional service for traditional promotion and tenure systems. In addition, some colleges and universities have taken on the equally important task of finding new and innovative ways to reward faculty professional service through the creation or expansion of alternative reward systems. Faculty service portfolios, merit pay for excellence in service, faculty service awards with stipends, and weighting systems that encourage faculty to design their own service plans and evaluation systems are just a few of the alternatives.

Methodology

This researcher reviewed over 400 promotion and tenure documents and faculty handbooks to find examples of colleges and universities of all types and in all regions that were making strides in rewarding faculty professional service. The method for this research was to locate archival material with a wide range of current institutional promotion and tenure documents and scrutinize these documents for criteria that would assist the researcher in identifying ways to document and evaluate faculty professional service. Institutional policies on promotion and tenure were collected from the following sources. Over 280 documents came from the American Association of Higher Education's (AAHE) "Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards." One hundred twenty documents came from AAHE's "Campus documents collection." In addition, a snowball technique was implemented wherein organizations with knowledge of faculty professional service issues were asked to recommend institutions that might have written policies addressing documentation or evaluation of faculty professional service. To this end, Campus Compact, The American Council on Education (ACE), and numerous colleges and universities throughout the country provided me with information and documents. All documents used in the study were current as of the last four years.

These data were examined in relationship to the current research and literature on faculty professional service. Documents were copied, coded, and evaluated for the

following information (1) the definition of faculty professional service provided (2) the format to document faculty professional service (i.e., letter from department chair, portfolio, resume, faculty development plan) (3) the evaluator of the service and (4) the criteria for excellence used to evaluate the service, including their rating system. From the 400 documents, twenty-six four-year institutions with approaches to defining, documenting and/or evaluating faculty professional service were chosen to discuss in this paper. A list of these documents is provided in the appendix along with a short description of the information used in this paper.

A limitation of the study is that it does not include data for faculty about how the policies work in action. Rather than choosing from a random sample of institutions, or developing a representative sample, this study used archival materials in order to find models to describe faculty professional service policies in colleges. Another limitation is that the study did not utilize actual faculty professional service documentation or portfolios.

Faculty Professional Service: A History of Mixed Messages

The history of faculty professional service in American higher education is almost as long as the history of the American college and university itself. The commitment to service outside the university (outreach) or what we are now calling faculty professional service, was much strengthened by the Morrill Act of 1862 which established the state land grant colleges and universities (Rudolph, 1990; Adamay, 1994). From this act, and the Hatch and the Smith-Lever Acts that followed, came the cooperative extension system, agricultural experiment stations, and an understanding between the government and universities that one of their purposes would be to utilize knowledge for the betterment of their state, country and world (Lynton, 1995). After the Morrill Act of 1890 which provided additional money for universities, including state-funded black colleges, American higher education added service to its teaching and research mission in a way that private and public universities (that had previously been primarily devoted to the intellectual and moral development of its students) had not done before (Washington, 1993). During both world wars faculty served as consultants to industry, state and local governments and to human service agencies, as well as scientists and experts in the defense industry. The G.I. Bill, which increased both the number and the diversity of students, also drew on the expertise of faculty in the development of large numbers of communities that were being established around universities.

Although most colleges and universities agree that they would like to employ faculty who are skilled at teaching, research and service, they rarely hire, promote, or give tenure based on the service aspect of a faculty member's career (Crosson, 1983). Therefore, faculty are unlikely to engage in professional service as part of their workload when they are not held accountable or rewarded for that work by the institution. For example, in a 1995 survey of faculty in the New England region conducted by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) 92 percent of faculty said they were encouraged to engage in professional service, but only 31 percent said there were explicit criteria used to document and evaluate professional service in promotion and tenure decisions at their university. In the, "Faculty Attitudes and Characteristics: Results of a 1995-1996 survey," 78.2 percent of all faculty in the study reported having performed service in the community in the last two years, and 59.2 percent of faculty noted that their institution was committed to the welfare of the local community (Chronicle, 1996).

Faculty professional service has also become an issue outside the academy as more and more citizens demand service in return for their tax dollars. Within the last five years over 30 state legislatures faced with scarce resources pushed state higher education systems to reengineer their faculty workload and reward systems to provide more time and rewards for teaching and professional service (M.H.E.C., 1994). Therefore, the need to reevaluate the scholarship of application is coming from, and has implications for, not only faculty, but for the university as a whole and the communities they serve.

Looking Ahead

Currently the climate in higher education makes this a particularly generative time for developing the outreach mission of the university. First, the rise of student community service and service-learning is at an all-time high, with some suggesting that one in three college students are now involved in service in some way. Second, the work of Donald Schön (1983) and others who have demonstrated the importance of "theory to practice," and, "reflection in action," have paved the way for the further development of outreach. Third, Boyer's (1990) reconceptualization of scholarship as well as his vision for a "New American College," have captured the attention of higher education. Ernest Boyer described four primary scholarly activities: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of application. In this last scholarly activity, the scholarship of application,

faculty participate in applied research and outreach to communities, businesses, and individuals. The faculty member's expertise in academic areas is linked to specific problems. Theory and practice interact, and new discoveries develop from application. It is the scholarship of application which this paper addresses. Trower's (1995) research found that a great number of universities have applied Boyer's principles to promotion and tenure documents. Similarly, my research uncovered over 75 universities that have directly applied these principles to their promotion and tenure procedures and philosophies.

Promotion and tenure have been the main features of the academic reward system for faculty for most of the 20th century (Chait, 1995). The National Center for Higher Education Statistics (1990) reports that 71 percent of all institutions have a tenure system and that faculty on campuses with tenure systems comprise 81 percent of all full time faculty. Chait (1995) notes that despite the controversy over promotion and tenure it has not changed significantly in the last decade. In a study of promotion and tenure, he observed more tenure decisions based on precedents, increased use of post-tenure reviews, and increased connection between tenure and institutional priorities. This tendency toward promotion and tenure decisions being made on the basis of precedents presents both an opportunity and a challenge to faculty. Faculty who excel in this area and are passed through the committee pave the way for other faculty who will be compared to this standard. There is a need for institutions to place faculty with extensive experience in faculty professional service on promotion and tenure committees in order to evaluate candidates' service scholarship. The increased use of post-tenure performance reviews suggests new opportunities for faculty to negotiate their roles and the amount of time they will spend on each form of scholarship. If tenure is linked to institutional priorities, a faculty member skilled in an area of service linked to an institutional priority is more likely to be awarded tenure. Those faculty in non-tenure track positions may be able to negotiate inducements such as sabbaticals and faculty development leaves, as well as funds or other resources to focus more of their time on faculty professional service.

Rewarding Faculty Professional Service Through the Promotion and Tenure System

Despite the recent attention and modifications which the traditional promotion and tenure system has undergone in the last few years, it is as strong as ever and is likely to remain the main foundation of reward systems in the future. Therefore, rather

than attempting to create alternative methods of encouraging and rewarding faculty professional service, those interested in professional service need to concentrate on the main source of validation and accreditation of faculty activity, the promotion and tenure system. Many colleges and universities have either ignored this area of faculty scholarship altogether, or given it so little priority in their decisions that faculty had few reason to engage in the service, or if they did, to prepare documentation of their work for a promotion and tenure committee. At best most colleges and universities simply ask faculty to provide a list of college governance, advising, and community activities. This contrasts with teaching and research documentation, which includes teaching evaluations, peer reviews, teaching portfolios, peer reviewed journal articles, and research in progress. This paper reports only institutions that have sophisticated accounts of professional service.

As colleges and universities attempt to move from listing activities to assessing evidence in evaluating service scholarship they run up against several issues: how to define faculty professional service in promotion and tenure documents; how to document faculty professional service; the criteria with which to evaluate service; and determining who the appropriate evaluators of this kind of scholarship are.

Defining faculty professional service

A significant problem for many colleges and universities is defining faculty professional service. The word "teaching" conjures up mental images of students, faculty and syllabi. The word "research" suggests journal articles, reports, and/or laboratories. This is true despite the fact that technology is greatly changing the teaching and learning process and new epistemologies such as action research are changing the face of research. However, the words "faculty professional service," do not yet command a uniform image, but rather a mix match of images that vary from faculty directing girl scout troops to developing an intake evaluation for a local homeless shelter. In the last few years scholars such as Boyer (1990), Lynton, (1995) Rice (1995) Elm and Smock (1985) and others have begun to develop a portrait of faculty professional service, within the larger context of scholarship. As institutions attempt to include faculty professional service more substantially in their promotion and tenure systems, many realize they must first find clear, precise ways of defining this scholarly activity. My recommendations for defining faculty professionals service in promotion and tenure documents draws on the work of Boyer, Lynton, and Rice as well

as examples from colleges and universities that are beginning to rewrite the definition of faculty professional service.

First, the definition of faculty professional service should be closely linked to and embedded within the mission of the university.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison includes in its promotion and tenure documents "the Wisconsin Idea," a mission statement declaring that the boundaries of the University are as open as the boundaries of the state. It then follows this up by discussing and defining outreach service as scholarship which "discovers, integrates, applies and disseminates the knowledge, wisdom and values necessary for survival and for improving the quality of life in the state of Wisconsin, and by extension, the world." By connecting the definition of professional service and the mission of the university, Wisconsin reaffirms its desire to connect academic expertise and resources with the state of Wisconsin.

The University of California Monterey Bay's mission states, "[t]he identity of CRUMB is framed by substantive commitment to a multi-lingual, multicultural, intellectual community distinguished by partnerships with existing institutions, both public and private, and by cooperative agreements which enable students, faculty and staff to cross institutional boundaries for innovative instruction, broadly defined scholarly and creative activity, and coordinated community service." By defining the faculty professional service mission within the mission of the university, professional service is reinforced as a university mission which can be completed by an individual faculty member, a team of faculty, or as an institution. It is not ancillary but rather at the center of what the university is about. It is a contract with the state.

Second, the definition should emphasize that the work is completed using a faculty member's academic expertise.

Elman and Smock in their 1985 report "Professional Service and Faculty Rewards" first defined faculty professional service as, "work based on the faculty member's professional expertise that contributes to the mission of the institution." The New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE), Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and Michigan State University as well as many others have adopted this emphasis within their definitions. For example, IUPUI states, "professional service is the application by faculty members (including those with clinical ranks) and librarians of knowledge, skills, or expertise developed within their discipline or profession as a

scholar, teacher, administrator, or practitioner." IUPUI underscores not only that faculty professional service is completed using professional expertise but also that that expertise may have been developed from a variety of experiences as a scholar. It is an important emphasis for two reasons. It places the significance of the faculty professional service not only within the mission of the institution but also within a faculty member's discipline and department. Also, it illustrates that, like teaching and research, faculty professional service is an intellectual process requiring the same amount of expertise, rigor, and commitment as that of teaching and research. It is a "scholarly" process.

Third, the definition should describe faculty professional service as an activity that extends beyond the university, providing intellectual resources to external constituencies.

As the reader may have noticed the terms "faculty professional service" and "outreach" are used interchangeably by universities to describe this scholarly activity. Outreach implies that the faculty member's service reaches outside of the university to external constituencies and is distinct from internal activities solely with students or other faculty. This does not preclude the faculty member's integrating his or her professional service with his or her teaching and research, rather it simply requires an outside audience or beneficiary of the scholarly activity. Portland State University stated that outreach was "the conceptualization and resolution of social issues, locally, nationally and internationally." Wisconsin stated, "[t]he Wisconsin Idea reflects a bond and an obligation between this university and the people of this state. Outreach activity will, therefore, be focused on responding to the social, economic, environmental and educational problems of Wisconsin." The University of California-Davis, in a report on outreach, defined public service as "encompassing all activity based upon a faculty member's research or professional expertise directed toward a non-University audience, i.e., an audience which lies outside one's academic or professional peers." IUPUI , Michigan State University, and Georgia State University indicated that the work serve a group outside the university.

Fourth, the definition should differentiate among several kinds of service and should provide specific examples of what is and what is not considered professional service.

Two ways to distinguish between kinds of service are the *kind of work involved*, and *the clientele the work serves*. Lynton differentiates between different forms of

service, clearly distinguishing faculty professional service from what he calls institutional and disciplinary citizenship. Institutional citizenship includes committee work, student advising, and participation in institutional operations. Disciplinary citizenship describes participation in the operations of a discipline's professional associations. Portland State University also differentiates between forms of service based on the nature of the work as citizenship versus community outreach. "'Citizenship' is those activities that involve participation in the processes of self governance and civic activities that aid the functioning of the university, community, or profession. In general these citizenship activities can be distinguished from what we refer to as 'outreach' activities. These activities refer to the conceptualization and resolution of social issues, locally, nationally, and internationally." These activities require the highest levels of disciplinary and interdisciplinary expertise, and can be applied against all the criteria of scholarship. Community outreach activities are those that are tied directly to one's special field of knowledge. IUPUI, on the other hand, differentiates between forms of service by the clientele the work serves: service to students, service to the institution, service to the discipline or profession, and service to the community. In this example, service to the community is described as faculty professional service.

Many campuses find it useful to clearly designate kinds of professional service in the promotion and tenure materials. Portland State University provides the following examples of faculty professional service: "contributing to the definition or resolution of a problem or issue that should be of concern to society, contributing to the evaluation of existing practices or programs, use of the state of the art knowledge to facilitate change in an organization or institution, publishing in journals or presentations at disciplinary or interdisciplinary meetings that advance the scholarship of community outreach." IUPUI includes these examples of faculty professional service, "providing extension education, testing concepts and processes in real world situations, and providing public policy analysis for local state national and international governmental agencies." California State University Monterey Bay describes the following kinds of faculty professional service, "translating data into policies and practices, consultancies, grant writing, in-service workshops to school districts, educating non-specialists." The University of Wisconsin describes outreach service as advisory or consultative assistance to policy boards, government or business, sustained expert testimony to policy bodies, service to non-scholarly audiences that is consistent with the mission of the department. It is also important to provide examples of what is not considered professional service such as working on construction projects with Habitat for

Humanity, serving food in a soup kitchen or other community service activities which though important, are not reflective of scholarship.

Fifth, the definition of service should acknowledge service as a form of scholarship, which like teaching and research can be done well and can be done poorly.

Portland State University defines faculty professional service first as scholarship. Their consensus is that the four expressions of scholarship are discovery, integration, application and interpretation. The three traditional activities of scholarship are teaching, research and outreach. The four expressions describe ways in which a scholar may work with knowledge in any of the three traditional roles of a faculty member. For example, discovery in research could be traditional basic research, discovery in teaching could be new inquiry based teaching methodology, and discovery in outreach could be development and evaluation of an intervention program. IUPUI makes the connection between the definition of faculty professional service and scholarship by stating within the definition that the same criteria for quality scholarship which can be applied to research and teaching can and should be applied to faculty professional service. The University of Georgia makes this distinction in their documentation section by stating that, "the University distinguishes between routine performance and service that draws upon the breadth and depth of scholarship." One of the ways that promotion and tenure documents support professional service as scholarship is to require evidence from faculty that applies preset standards which are also applied to teaching and research. In the following section, suggestions for documenting the scholarly nature of professional service are provided.

Documenting faculty professional service

Ernest A. Lynton (1995) in his seminal work on faculty professional service suggests that faculty professional service, like all scholarship, should be designed with assessment in mind. Therefore, although various kinds of one-time or intermittent projects may be considered part of a workload in terms of service, only projects of sufficient substance she be brought before a promotion and tenure committee so as to provide an adequate unit of assessment. Colleges and universities that want to encourage and reward faculty professional service must be sure that promotion and tenure documents, faculty handbooks, and faculty orientation and development programs address ways for faculty professional service to be documented and

evaluated as scholarship. Just as workshops prepare new faculty to develop teaching portfolios, means should be developed to prepare faculty to use professional service portfolios or methods of evaluation.

Analysis of the promotion and tenure documents showed that while many colleges and universities require faculty to document their service, most simply require lists of places, people, or events faculty have worked with. This kind of documentation emphasizes an evaluation of *quantity* of service experiences, not the *quality* or *degree* to which the service is scholarship. Just as we would not evaluate or assess a faculty member's application for tenure based on number of classes taught or simply numbers of published research articles, we should not evaluate faculty on how many service experiences they engage in, but the quality and nature of those experiences. This kind of evaluation requires a specific kind of evidence and data. Portland State provides this guidance to its faculty. "Documentation and evaluation of scholarship should focus on the quality and significance of scholarship, rather than on a recitation of tasks and projects." While some institutions described evidence which could be collected to describe teaching, research and service, others provided specific examples of kinds of evidence required for each form of scholarship. Those institutions that provided specific examples of documentation also had carefully defined what constitutes faculty professional service.

The types of evidence used to document faculty professional service is derived from both promotion and tenure documents reviewed in this study and from recommendations by Lynton and others in this field. This is not an exhaustive list. The goal for each form of evidence is that it demonstrate the degree to which the faculty professional service is high quality scholarship.

•Personal Statements/Narratives/Self Evaluations

Perhaps no piece of documentation is as important as the description of the project by the individual faculty member. Individual faculty should keep an ongoing record of his or her activities, pertinent artifacts and a log of his or her reflections. "The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching," by Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan (1991) provides an excellent guide for thinking about teaching as scholarship. This piece can also be adapted by faculty looking to develop a professional service portfolio to present service as scholarship. Lynton, in his

monograph *Making the Case for Professional Service*, suggests personal statements include:

- the context of the activity
- the scholarly expertise brought to the project
- the goals of the activity
- the choice of methods and resources and their assessment
- the results of the ongoing reflections
- the impact of the work on the scholar's subsequent professional service, teaching, and research activities
- a self evaluation of the perceived outcomes of the project and their implications

Portland State University requires a "Documentation of Focus: Narrative Describing the Scholarly Agenda. "This would include the why (motivation), how (discovery/creativity, integration, application, interpretation), and what (content) of the faculty member's scholarship as well as a discussion of its impact. This statement provides essential information about the context of each faculty member's scholarly endeavors. It is a foundation for the evaluation process."

•Work Samples and Products

Work samples and products such as interview protocols, syllabi, course revisions, final reports, grants, and publications resulting from the service, should also be provided to promotion and tenure committees as documentation. Since many faculty engage in research with and for non-profit agencies, work products such as research or evaluation designs for agencies, planning or development materials, or phone or on-site consultation outcomes reports may be appropriate to include. All the institutions in this study stressed the importance of publications related to the faculty member's professional service. Portland State University emphasizes that, "[n]o matter what type of work we engage in, the work must be communicated to peers and documented for quality and significance of impact. Evidence of this includes journals, articles, books and book chapters, lectures, presentations, technical reports, software, media productions." Publications on the service will accomplish two things: it may help the promotion and tenure committee understand how the service has been integrated into the research aspect of the faculty member's position, and it may enhance the scholarship of the activity itself by communicating it to larger audiences.

•Evaluations by Clients or Sponsors

Evaluations should also be collected from the primary recipients of the service, the clients or sponsors of the activity, and experts in the subject matter for inclusion in a faculty professional service portfolio. Some important areas to include in these evaluations are the impact the project had, the process by which it was completed, and what the project has provided for in the future. Portland State University states that "documentation for promotion and tenure should include evaluations of accomplishments by peers, and other multiple credible sources (e.g. students, community participants, and subject matter experts." Georgia State suggests faculty include "[a]ssessment of quality by recognized leaders in the discipline." The University of Georgia requires "letters of recommendation from at least three off-campus authorities who can provide a critical and detailed evaluation of the candidate." When discussing this kind of evidence the University of Georgia underscores the following words in their promotion and tenure guidelines, "These letters are extremely important. They often make the difference between success and failure of a promotion recommendation. Each letter should not merely be supportive; it must be critically evaluative and analytical."

The Invisible College, a group of faculty committed to engaging in and supporting service-learning sponsored by Campus Compact, may be a resource for promotion and tenure committees as could peer reviewers of faculty professional service. New faculty could be advised to approach them as well for project review to include in service portfolios.

•Faculty Work Plans/Activity Reports/Curricula Vitae

Most of the colleges and universities reviewed suggested that one way to integrate the scholarship of service into every day academic life is to: (1) include progress on projects in monthly or yearly activity reports; (2) add achievements and events to vitaes; and (3) identify the significant landmarks in departmental work plans. These vehicles demonstrate the faculty member's intent to be held accountable in his or her everyday activities as a scholar. IUPUI in their promotion and tenure report list,

> a statement that shows how the professional service is consistent with the professional and career objectives of the faculty member, analysis of field notes or journal entries kept during the term of professional service, portions of the faculty member's annual reviews that address effectiveness of the professional service, minutes from Faculty Council meetings that show the impact of the

faculty member's professional service on practices or policies within the campus, or letters from a Task Force or committee chairperson about the significance of the faculty member's contribution to the Task Force or committee

as sources of documentation for professional service. All of these sources of evidence demonstrate to the promotion and tenure committee how the faculty member's professional service work is embedded within and similar to his or her other work as scholars (including field notes, sitting on committees, changing policies, and professional development).

•Faculty Portfolios

Perhaps the most promising way to collect all of the information suggested above for a promotion and tenure committee is the professional service portfolio. Faculty portfolios have three distinct advantages. First, they allow faculty to tell a story, highlighting what they consider to be the most significant accomplishments of their projects. Second, they are a form of presentation that are familiar to most promotion and tenure committees because of the popularity of portfolios to evaluate teaching. Third, they allow faculty to present information in creative ways such as through video, slides, interview texts, minutes of community meetings, computer programs, or other products that are specifically suited to the kind of project completed.

Eastern Mennonite University suggests faculty develop service portfolios when applying for promotion and tenure and that they include service goals for the year agreed upon by the faculty member and the dean, and a vitae of outreach activities. At the time service goals are decided, corresponding documentation of scholarship is also determined. Portland State University requires faculty portfolios or "a narrative describing the faculty member's scholarly agenda and identification of the type of activity, documentation of the outcomes and process of scholarly activity, documentation of communication, documentation of evaluation of quality and impact, and a description of the funding sources should be included in each faculty member's portfolio." Portland State suggests that self assessments, description of the procedures, feedback from others involved in the project, and an appraisal of outcomes are examples of other things which might be included in a faculty professional service portfolio. The University of Wisconsin suggests that faculty include as evidence for review: reports of benefits to recipients, new ideas gained that have an impact on their research, their teaching agenda, evidence of change in public policy, reports and evaluations of service. Documentation of circumstances in which outreach service, teaching and research have been combined are especially important to the University

of Wisconsin. NERCHE Senior Associate Ernest Lynton and Portland State University's Amy Driscoll currently co-direct NERCHE's Portfolio Project designed to develop prototype portfolios documenting faculty professional service. Sixteen participating faculty will document recent outreach projects and collaborate with faculty from their campuses and other institutions to develop mode of documentation that is appropriate for a broad range of fields, professions and service projects.

Developing criteria for excellence/assessment

If we define faculty professional service as scholarship, then it must be evaluated using criteria similar to those used for other forms of scholarship. The following six are the primary criteria in assessing the quality and scholarship of a faculty member's professional service, because they can be applied to the evaluation of all scholarship and, taken together, most clearly describe what makes professional service scholarship. These criteria were assembled from Lynton's work, IUPUI, Portland State University, the University of Georgia, the University of Wisconsin, and Michigan State.

•Use of Faculty Expertise

This category includes assessment of the preparation involved in the project; the degree to which the service project was built on prior training, research, or study; relationship to a departmental mission; and the degree to which the project builds on the faculty member's knowledge for future work. Different colleges stressed different aspects of this category of scholarship. For example, IUPUI refers to this category as "intellectual work [that] results in the conceptual and practical advancement of constituencies served, including those in the university or community." This requires that faculty members through their professional service demonstrate a command of the relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise, as well as integration of ideas, methodologies, or policies to solve problems. The University of Wisconsin recommends that the faculty member's expertise should be reflective of the departmental mission. Portland State refers to this aspect of scholarship as "mastery of existing knowledge" while Michigan State calls it, "Scholarly Characteristics and Contributions, and Contextualization." Some of the questions Michigan State focuses on are: To what extent was up-to date knowledge used? To what extent was there an awareness of replicable models, experts and/or writing related to the issue and

approach to be taken? To what extent did the project fit with the individual's and the unit's available expertise and research and outreach priorities?

Clarity and Appropriateness of Goals and Methods

Good scholarship requires a clear fit between research questions and methods of inquiry. Portland State emphasizes the clarity of goals and the appropriateness of methodologies chosen in the professional service. Michigan State assesses the methodological approach for whether or not needs assessments were conducted, a logical plan with a beginning and ending was developed, or a comprehensive and informative evaluation plan was carried out. Questions that should be asked in this category are: How clear are the goals and objectives of this project? Are the goals appropriate to meet the established needs of the community agency? Which methods were used and why? IUPUI stresses the integration of, "ideas, methodologies, or policies to solve problems." Therefore, in evaluating professional service it is not only important to assess the faculty member's clarity of goals and choice of methodology but also in IUPUI's words, "to place isolated knowledge or observations in perspective and made connections across theories, models or applications and integrate knowledge from the scholarly community with knowledge from practitioners to solve a problem."

Effectiveness of Communication and Dissemination

Just as some have advocated that teaching become more of a public act through peer review and communication about learning outcomes (Shulman, 1993), IUPUI stresses that professional service needs too to become a public act, especially through the interpretation and dissemination of outcomes. The University of Pittsburgh states that knowledge arising from professional service should be "disseminated through publications, such as documents, reports, and papers." Faculty should consider ways to interpret and communicate their professional service to multiple audiences. IUPUI suggests that video's, luncheon speeches, written reports, charts, financial impact reports, and journal articles may all be appropriate ways to communicate the results of service depending on the audience. Considerations in this category include: How were the results reported? Were presentations, papers, or publications used as ways to disseminate the results to other involved in similar work, to community members and to other faculty? Did the faculty member communicate the significance of the project to outside constituencies and incorporate the work into his or her research or teaching through service-learning? In a time when universities and faculty battle public mistrust, it is essential that faculty, department chairs and college presidents communicate and

disseminate the results of professional service work. It is also important to communicate the work in an integrated way so that it is not seen as a mutually exclusive category of service versus teaching and research, but rather viewed as scholarship which has components of all three.

•Significance of Impact and Results

The assessment of faculty professional service should take into account the potential internal and external benefits of the service project to individuals, communities and the institution. The University of Georgia states "the evidence should emphasize the impact, results, and outcome of the work rather than the quantity of products, the number of repetitions of a specific program, the number of participants, or the number of booklets distributed. Where problem complexity was an issue, it should be identified, as should the importance of the work to society in general or to the client group in particular." IUPUI points to the positive impacts on identified recipients, the missions and goals of the various levels of the campus, and the professional development of the faculty member. Often it is those community members who are recipients of the service who receive the greatest impact of the professional service, and the impact on the individual faculty member and department are secondary. The University of California-Davis contends that, "the ultimate value of a specific public service project may rest as much in the general and transferable knowledge acquired as in benefits supplied to the immediate user of the service." Michigan State University evaluates impact on the community partly through the amount of communication there was between the faculty member and the community agency. If there was positive two-way communication between the faculty member and the university, if both parties were satisfied with the relationship and the benefits that the relationship produced, then the project had a positive impact on the community. In addition, the degree to which the project met its goals, documented the impact, had an effect on the improvement of practice, as well as how the community perceived the impact are considered. The impact of the service on the department should be evaluated, as well as ways in which the service contributes to the mission of the institution as a whole or to the mission of the state system. Michigan State suggests that one way to evaluate the effect on the institution might be whether the project offered new opportunities for student learning and graduate student support, led to innovations in curriculum offerings, increased multi- or interdisciplinary collaborations within the university, informed the institution's mission, or assisted in developing outreach potential and visibility. Indiana University's School of Medicine states in its guidelines that evaluation of professional service

should also include "its effects on the development of the individual." Therefore, whereas some institutions weigh community impact highest in their assessment, others weigh department/university and individual impact equally.

Michigan State emphasizes the degree to which the project is *significant*. This means they not only assess whether the goals were clear or appropriate but also whether they reached the target audience. An assessment of how compelling the problem was, how well defined it was by the faculty member and the stakeholders, whether the project addressed the unit or university mission are critical as well as what resources were leveraged for the project. In addition, they assess whether sustainability and capacity building were built into the design of the program so that the community has additional resources or mechanisms to deal with the issue as a result of the faculty member's involvement with the project.

•Originality and Innovation

Discovery and originality in scholarship are important elements of Boyer's and Lynton's work. Scholarship requires that faculty learn something from the process and that they share this new information with colleagues. The learning can advance the knowledge of a discipline or contribute to the practice or methodology of service. The University of Georgia states in their promotion and tenure documents that, for promotion, they look for "evidence of the productive use of creativity and innovation in the candidate's area of specialization." Michigan State University addresses this issue in a category mentioned earlier called "Scholarly Characteristics and Contributions," which includes questions of both faculty expertise and innovation. Did the outreach activities generate new knowledge or represent a potential new interpretation or application for use in specific settings? Did the project make a unique contribution in addressing an issue? To what extent was there innovation of the application of interdisciplinary knowledge and methodology to the particular context of the project? Is the outreach generating new research questions? What effect did the initiative have on scholarship? On community knowledge?

•Quality of Reflection

As Schön's (1983) work suggests, reflection upon experience not only enhances professional development, but also the quality of scholarship, whether through teaching, research or service. Therefore, the faculty member's capacity to reflect and learn from their mistakes is paramount to good work. Lynton suggests the following questions for this category: Did the project contain adequate ways of monitoring its

progress and of assessing its outcomes? Were there any unanticipated developments spotted in a timely fashion, and did they lead to constructive adaptations? Did the faculty member draw appropriate inferences from the results? Other questions that might be asked are: Did the faculty member make significant connections between his or her teaching, research and service agendas in his or her reflections? Did the faculty member consider all aspects of the project in his or her reflections including his or her relationship with the community and the impact of the project on personal and professional development? Did the faculty member break through any barriers in his or her thinking? It is my opinion that the criteria of quality of reflection requires further research and could be better understood through the work of Donald Schön and John Dewey.

Secondary Criteria

In addition to the primary criteria for assessing the quality and scholarship of faculty professional service is a list of secondary criteria labeled so because they are specific to professional service and would not be ways to evaluate the scholarship of teaching or research.

•Sustaining Contribution and Leadership

This category is meant to recognize those faculty who go beyond the call of duty in their professional service work. IUPUI includes a quote in their promotion and tenure documents from the Modern Language Association, "[f]aculty members should be evaluated and rewarded for their constructive contributions to sustaining or leading the communities in which they do their professional work." Sustained contribution may entail intense involvement for a long period of time with the same community agency, with work that builds on itself. The School of Education at IUPUI writes in their stipulations for promotion from assistant to associate professor that evidence must show, "outstanding performance over a period of years." The amount of time spent is not as critical as the level of commitment. Leadership might include initiating and organizing ideas, activities, practices or programs, providing a vision, soliciting collaboration, or guiding a group toward a successful outcome.

•Dynamic Interaction of Service, Research and Teaching

Boyer emphasizes that teaching, research and service, "can dynamically interact, forming an interdependent whole." The University of California-Davis states

that for its Distinguished Public Service Award, "public service is an organized activity that extends a faculty member's expertise in teaching, research and professional outreach outside the campus service." IUPUI emphasizes that academic units should assist faculty in integrating their professional service activities with other aspects of their careers. This ensures that professional service does not detract from other faculty activities but instead helps them improve their teaching techniques and publish in peer reviewed journals. In *Making the Case for Professional Service*, Ernest Lynton states that "it is time to bury the triad of teaching, research, and service with its implication that these are three distinct and different activities that sometimes accidentally reinforce one another." Rather, he suggests we stress the "essential similarity of all manifestations of scholarship." Portland State University's "expressions of scholarship" concept captures this well. Therefore, professional service that is embedded within or connected to teaching and research is enriched.

Responsiveness to the Needs of Recipients/Degree of Collaboration

While many campuses were concerned with reciprocity in working "with" and not "for" the community in professional service, none went so far as Michigan State University in stressing its importance. This university paid the most attention to insuring diversity, collaboration with the community as partners in the learning as well as teaching process and with the products that are left in the community after collaboration. Some of the criteria for assessing the service throughout their, "Matrix for Evaluating the Quality of Outreach Activities," included: What knowledge base for addressing the issue resided in the community or with the constituents? Did the project result in additional resources being leveraged for the community stakeholders? What types of partnerships were established? What contribution did the collaboration make to capacity building? Was there a two-way flow of communication? How was the issue defined by its stakeholders? What kinds of partnerships and collaborations were established? The University of Wisconsin also used this category as one of its primary ways to evaluate faculty on their professional service.

Key questions regarding diversity are: Did the faculty involved in the project demonstrate sensitivity to diverse audiences and stakeholders? How were the variety of learning styles of the target audience recognized and accommodated? Embedded in this criteria and the next criteria are issues of social justice. In other words, many faculty work with community members or groups with less power and privilege than themselves. Did faculty understand and accommodate for differences between

themselves and their working styles and the communities' culture, race, religious, socioeconomic, or political makeup?

-***Consistently Ethical Behavior***

According to Portland State, "[s]cholarly work implies acting with honesty, integrity, and objectivity. Exemplary scholars foster a continuing respectful relationship with students, community participants, peers and others engaged in or receiving the benefits of scholarly work." Human subject reviews in research projects and attributing sources in one's writing are just a few examples. Michigan State University's examples of qualitative indicators of the quality of outreach activities include, "Trust established," (between the community and faculty member(s)). Although the argument can be made that teachers must establish trust with their students, and a trust must be established between a researcher and his reader, issues of differential power and privilege between the faculty member and those with whom they work in the community may make establishing trust in this kind of scholarship even more critical .

Appropriate evaluators of faculty professional service

There are two groups of evaluators of faculty professional service. These are (1) the clients, community leaders, peers, and other people who provide evaluations at the request of the faculty member for the faculty member's own assessment and for his or her portfolio and (2) those faculty or committee members who evaluate all of the documentation for promotion and tenure. I have already discussed the former and will now address the latter. There has long been an understanding in higher education that the only people who are qualified to judge faculty for promotion and tenure are other faculty, usually senior and tenured. Within the promotion and tenure documents discussed, even public universities rarely allowed evaluations from outside academe and, in fact, rarely sought evaluations outside the discipline. Unlike many reviews of teaching and research which utilize only faculty from their home or peer institutions, the review of faculty professional service by its very nature requires committee members to consider the evaluations of non-academics in the form of community members, government officials and practitioners engaged in similar work. Asking these non-academics to sit on or consult with promotion and tenure committees is a new idea, but one that promises to blur the boundaries between the academy and the community.

Portland State University states that peers, students, community participants, subject matter experts and funding sources are all potential evaluators of the quality and impact of the faculty professional service. If the promotion and tenure committee must be made up of only other faculty then it should at least have faculty experienced in and knowledgeable about professional service. The University of Wisconsin states, "it is desirable that the membership of Divisional Committees include faculty with substantive outreach experience."

Alternative Ways to Reward Faculty Professional Service

Many colleges and universities are beginning to look beyond the traditional promotion and tenure system for ways to reward faculty for professional service, as well as teaching and research. The following examples of special professorships, merit pay, weighting systems, awards, funding for special projects, and faculty development plans represent just a few examples discovered in this research.

•Special Professorships (Faculty Profiles in Service)

Advocates of special professorships propose that it is not likely for a single faculty member to excel equally in teaching, research, and service. Differential profiles allow faculty to concentrate on their areas of interest and strengths. The result is higher quality in each activity combined with a greater diversity of approaches to issues in each area.

Portland State University advocates that faculty design "scholarly agendas" within their departments.

> A scholarly agenda articulates an individual's focus on contributions to knowledge through varying weights and emphases on each of the scholarly responsibilities of research and creative activities, teaching and curricular activities and community outreach. A scholarly agenda includes a set of questions, issues, or problems that interest and engage an individual, that give coherence and meaning beyond individual activities, and have relevance to the larger scholarly community. It identifies the target audience of the scholarly work (e.g., discipline, students, community) and the importance of those activities to the audiences.

While all faculty are expected to achieve at least minimal standards in all areas of scholarship, faculty profiles differ in the weighting of the three areas (research, outreach, and teaching) among faculty.

The University of Georgia has developed an alternative appointment for faculty interested in engaging in the scholarship of public service. The appointments are called "Public Service Appointments" and are part of a corresponding public service career ladder, equal to the traditional career ladder, at the university with mobility from assistant to full public service faculty member. General categories of responsibilities include instruction and training; policy, legal, and other applied research; consultation and technical assistance; and other related projects. The following excerpt explains the purpose of public service appointments and their relationship to other professorships.

> The alternative is for public service professionals to use a separate career ladder that reflects the various types of public service functions. The definitions and criteria used would relate more directly to the professional service performed by public service faculty that differ from those performed by teaching and research faculty in ways that make the traditional criteria for appointment and promotion inadequate or inappropriate. At the same time, public service professionals, as full members of the academic community, should conform in the highest degree possible to the institutions pursuit of intellectual excellence. Furthermore, they should possess the same academic credentials and professional experience required by any outstanding institution of higher education.

The University of Georgia's program enables faculty to concentrate their abilities and skills in areas where they are most capable and provides a reward system which evaluates them "from standards more directly related to the competencies required and the quality and success of the public services performed." The public service professorships are designed within departments and approved by the dean, allowing the faculty member's service agenda to be linked directly with the mission of the department and university. "Public Service Rank: Guidelines for Appointments and Promotion" handbooks clearly state the criteria by which faculty will be evaluated. Examples such as Human Services Associate, and Governmental Research Associate are included. The University of Georgia also reward faculty for other kinds of scholarship, including regents professorships, which honor truly outstanding scholarship, university professorships which honor change agents within the university, and research professorships which recognize outstanding research and other creative accomplishments. These professorships are awarded for five years with permanent salary increases of between $5,000 and $10,0000.

•Weighting Systems

Montclair State University in New Jersey offers a Faculty Scholarship Incentive Program based on Boyer's four kinds of scholarship; discovery, teaching, pedagogy, and application. Through negotiations with the university, the faculty union developed a two-year scholarship plan that allow faculty to weight each form of scholarship (weighting being the percentage of time devoted to a form of scholarship) at different levels for evaluation. All faculty must weight teaching at least 30 percent of their time, and no single area lower than 15 percent, with other weights determined by the individual. For example, a faculty member most interested in engaging in faculty professional service could confirm with his or her department chair that 40 percent of his or her time in the next two years would be spent on application/service scholarship, 30 percent on teaching, 15 percent on pedagogy, and 15 percent on discovery or research. The faculty member would then be evaluated based on these percentages and his or her scholarship in these areas respectively. Dr. Kenneth Brook, who negotiated this plan with the university on the part of the faculty union, reports that the productivity of faculty since the inception of this program was recently evaluated and has been extraordinary.

Golden Gate University has a similar program wherein faculty work with the dean on an annual basis to determine the composition of responsibilities for the year. Two areas are weighted: (1) scholarship, including teaching, integration, application, and discovery; (2) university service, including university-wide service as well as faculty professional service. Scholarship can be weighted anywhere between 50-80 percent and University Service anywhere between 20-50 percent.

The University of Wisconsin suggests that a department's outreach mission may be reflected at some level in every faculty member's responsibilities, at varying times in the responsibilities of a few faculty members or in appointments carrying significant outreach responsibilities (up to 100% of the appointment).

•Merit Pay for Excellence in Service

The College of Education of the University of Alabama at Birmingham has 100 percent of raises based on merit emphasizing teaching (33%), scholarly activity (33%) and service (33%) equally. In their materials they claim, "[w]e don't just say that, we actually do it." The advantage is that rewarding professional service work with merit pay further legitimizes and institutionalizes the work within the university. On the other hand, since professional service has not yet developed agreed upon criteria for

evaluation, faculty may be overlooked for merit pay. Also, many faculty engaging in service currently do so for intrinsic reasons, and merit pay would not necessarily attract more faculty to this work.

•Faculty Awards With/Without Funding for Service Projects

Rather than finding new rewards for faculty, most colleges and universities interested in encouraging faculty toward some activity utilize well-known or formerly successful ways to reward faculty. For example, at the University of Maryland College Park faculty were encouraged to join a living-learning program for honors level students through course release or summer professional development grants. Similarly, faculty can be rewarded through special consideration for curriculum innovation grants, professional development grants, sabbatical leaves, course release, or committee releases. The University of Alabama at Birmingham writes that, "when reviewing faculty development grants, priority will be given to good proposals that relate to service to the local community." By taking well established honors, and rewards and giving preference to those applicants working on professional service projects, the University/department chair makes a powerful statement to all faculty that, "we value and reward this work."

•Faculty Development Plans, and Post-tenure Reviews

Another strategy for increasing the productivity and reflectiveness of faculty is that institutions, with or without tenure, include faculty in planning for the academic year. This planning could include charting out service activities, potential collaborations with other faculty, curricular innovations resulting from service, etc. The advantages of goal-setting include clarification of expectations and negotiation of activities and documentation. A faculty member concentrating on outreach would develop a coherent and integrated program aimed at a community issue and might want to allocate additional time to consulting nationally, directing undergraduate capstone experiences in community settings, and developing relevant publications.

Post-tenure reviews provide the same opportunity at longer intervals of three and five years and could allow faculty to consider ways to differentiate their career path and/or take on new projects or areas. Both of these areas can be used by academic departments and universities to help faculty deliberately plan for and be evaluated on their professional service.

Conclusions

Universities that are beginning the process of integrating faculty professional service into their reward systems are undertaking a complex and often difficult task. This process of integration is linked to fundamental questions about the nature of scholarship, evaluation of faculty, the university-community relationship, and the mission of the institution.

A useful way to begin a discussion on these possibly thorny issues is to use Lynton's "Ten Questions for Departmental Discussion." These can be applied to a department or other unit such as a division, school, or at small campuses institution-wide. Some of these questions are; What kinds of outreach activities are possible within our discipline or professional field? What measures of scholarly quality make sense for us? How can we best communicate our professional service with potential clients so as to get their input with regard to needs and priorities? These questions can be used to help a group of faculty or a department set priorities and develop a strategy for getting involved in professional service.

More global questions come from the university as a whole, from the community, and from faculty engaging in professional service across the country. When we discuss faculty professional service as a form of scholarship to be rewarded in the university, we must include all of our work and the relationships among all of its parts. In the following paragraphs, I discuss a few of the issues and questions that this research raised for me.

The first concerns women and faculty professional service. If we return for a moment to the 1995-1996 Faculty Attitudes survey published in the Chronicle of Higher Education, women faculty rated service as a priority and had been involved in it more often then male faculty. Finkelstein's (1989), Sagaria's (1991), and others' research has demonstrate that teaching and service have always been higher priorities for women in the academy. Since teaching and service are rated by promotion and tenure committees as least important in many institutions, women faculty are further disadvantaged. Finding effective ways to evaluate, document, reward and encourage faculty professional service is important to improving the conditions and breaking through the glass ceiling for women in the academy.

Other unresolved issues are payment for service and recipients of service. The University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana takes the position that fees that are excessive preclude inclusion under service. Related to this issue is the disagreement about whether service must address a public concern or assist the poor as opposed to

private organizations. Should faculty professional service be geared towards increasing social justice? If the mission of the university includes a social justice mission, such as Jesuit colleges, then must the professional service serve a segment of society that is disadvantaged? Should faculty professional service which is completed for a religious organization that a faculty member belongs to be considered service? These questions seem to be causing great disagreement within higher education. What is often ignored however, is that the same questions arise when evaluating teaching and research. Should classes taught outside of the academy be allowed in a teaching portfolio? Should co-authored research be evaluated in the same way single-authored research is? Where do we draw the line between professional activities and professional service? There are no easy answers except to return to the standard set for all faculty activities and ask the question, "What is scholarship?" This is a debate that will not end soon.

Those interested in promoting faculty professional service in colleges and universities can take lessons from AAHE's Teaching Initiative. In the past ten years they have taught hundreds of campuses how to document, evaluate, and create standards for excellence in teaching as a form of scholarship. Whereas 15 years ago the idea of teaching portfolios to evaluate teaching, peer reviews, and the constructive use of student evaluations were not commonly used by promotion and tenure committees, they are much more common today. The same could be true in 15 years for evaluating and rewarding excellence in faculty professional service.

This research, which discussed over 400 promotion and tenure documents to understand how colleges and universities reward faculty professional service, uncovered best practices from only 26 institutions. The very fact that only 6.5 percent of the universities demonstrated attention to this issue means faculty professional service is not yet being addressed through traditional or nontraditional reward systems in most institutions. These 26 colleges and universities were willing to wade through difficult questions, policies, and practices as they map new terrain. This territory is plagued by uncertainty, but has the potential to shape the future of scholarship in higher education. Similar to the way that AAHE's Teaching Initiative opened a door for the scholarship of teaching, it is now time for colleges and universities to open a door to aligning service mission statements with service reward systems. When this happens, institutions will no longer be cast as ivory towers, but as dynamic learning organizations committed to supporting students, faculty, and staff as they apply knowledge to individual and community problems.

Work Cited

Boyer, E. (1990) Scholarship Reconsidered. Princeton, NJ. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Chait, R. (1995) "The Future of Academic Tenure," Priorities, Number 3, Spring.

Crosson, P.H. (1983) Public Service in Higher Education ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report, No. 7 .

Edgerton, Russell, Patricia Hutchings, and Kathleen Quinlan. (1991) "The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching." Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Elman, S.E. and Smock, S.M. (1985) "Professional Service and Faculty Rewards: Toward and Integrated Structure." Washington, D.C. National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Finkelstein, M.J. (1989) "Conveying Messages to Women." American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 32, No. 6, July/August.

Hutchings, P. and Shulman, L. Documents from the American Association of Higher Education Teaching Initiative.

Lynton, E. A. (1995) Making the Case for Professional Service. American Association for Higher Education.

M.H.E.C. (1994) (Maryland Higher Education Commission). Documents collected for Internal study of faculty workload issue.

New England Resource Center for Higher Education (1996) Documents from "Program on Faculty Professional Service and Academic Outreach."

Rice, R.E. (1991) "The New American Scholar: Scholarship and the Purposes of the University." Metropolitan Universities 1, Spring: 7-18.

Sagaria, M. and Moore, S. (1991) "The Situation of Women in Research Universities in the United States: Within the Inner Circles of Academic Power," Women's Higher Education in Comparative Perspective, Kleiwer Academic Publishers.

Schön, D.A. (1983)The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. New York: Basic Books.

Shulman, L.S. (1993) "Teaching as Community Property." Change 25, (Nov/Dec): 6-7.

Trower, C.A. (1995) "Tenure Snapshot," American Association of Higher Education.

Washington, R.O. (1993) "Implementing the Urban Mission of an Urban American University." Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Alliance of Universities for Democracy, November 7-11, Budapest, Hungary.

Appendix

This list contains the documents I discussed. Some are actual promotion and tenure documents, others are addenda or reports about promotion and tenure given to faculty. Immediately following each document, I have listed the kinds of information that were most useful for the purposes of the study.

California State University Monterey Bay	"Interim Criteria for Review, Promotion, and Tenure" Definitions, Documentation, Evaluators
College of Charleston	"Faculty/Administration Manual." Definition, Documentation, Criteria
Drury College	"Faculty Handbook." Forms, Criteria, Faculty Development
Elon College	"Faculty Evaluation System." Definitions
Golden Gate University	Promotion and Tenure Documents. Definitions, Documentation, Criteria for Excellence, Evaluators, Weighting System
Hampshire College	"Faculty Handbook." Faculty Profile
Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis	"IUPUI Task Force on Service" Definitions, Documentation, Criteria for Excellence, Evaluators, Faculty Development
Kansas State University	"Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion." Definitions, Evidence, Criteria
Kennesaw State College	"Faculty Activity Reports" on service Faculty Profiles/Weighting Systems
Michigan State University	"Four Dimensions of Quality Outreach. Matrix for Evaluating the Quality of Outreach Activities." Through series of questions presents components of Documentation, Criteria for Excellence, Evaluators

Middle Tennessee State University	Promotion and Tenure Documents. Definition, Documentation
Milligan College	"Faculty Development Report." Forms for service
Montclair State University	"Faculty Scholarship Incentive Program." University-Faculty Union agreement, Comprehensive Weighting System Program
Nicholls State University	"Promotion and Tenure Guiding Principles of Faculty Evaluation." Criteria of Excellence.
Portland State University	"Redefining Scholarship for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences." "Policies and Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure." Definitions, Documentation, Criteria for Excellence, Evaluators, Faculty Development
University of Georgia	"Public Service Academic Rank: Guidelines for Appointments and Promotion." Comprehensive Faculty Profiles Program
Queens College	"Service Dossier Recommendations," and Form
Sam Houston State University	Promotion and Tenure Documents. Criteria, Forms
Southern Arkansas University	"Annual Review of Faculty Performance." Forms, Documentation, Criteria
SUNY Buffalo	"Categories of Professional Academic Work and its Evaluation in the Graduate School of Education." Definition, Criteria for Excellence
University of Alabama	"Merit Salary Program, UAB School of Education." Documentation. Forms

University of California Davis	Promotion and Tenure Documents. Definitions
University of California San Diego	"Report of Task Force on Faculty Reward System." Definitions, Documentation, Criteria, Faculty Development
University of Illinois	"Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to Promotion and Tenure Review Process" Definitions, Examples of Kinds of Service, Documentation, Criteria, Evaluators, Advice on preparing service dossier for tenure.
University of Memphis	"Report of Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards." Definitions. Recommendations for Faculty Awards on Service
University of Wisconsin	"The Wisconsin Idea and Outreach." Definitions, Documentation, Criteria for Excellence, Evaluators
University of Utah	"Evaluating Service-Learning as a Component of Teaching in the Tenure Process"

About the New England Resource Center for Higher Education

The New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE), founded in 1988, is dedicated to improving colleges and universities as workplaces, communities, and organizations. NERCHE addresses this issue through think tanks, research, consulting, professional development, and publications.

New England Resource Center *for* Higher Education
University of Massachusetts at Boston
Graduate College of Education — W/2/143
Boston, Massachusetts 02125-3393
Tel: (617) 287-7740
Fax: (617) 287-7747
email: nerche@umbsky.cc.umb.edu